

The Armenian Image in History and Literature

RICHARD G. HOVANNISIAN

Editor

(Malibu, 1981)

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

Armenia and the Armenians through the Eyes of English Travelers of the Nineteenth Century

KEVORK BARDAKJIAN

The corpus of travel literature on Armenia and the Armenians is as diverse as the views of the travelers themselves and is exceedingly vast. What follows is a brief survey which confines its scope to an ethnically homogeneous group of travelers within a specific period of time. By no means an exhaustive examination, it describes some aspects of the image of Armenia and Armenians based on the accounts of twenty-eight English travelers who wandered through Armenia between 1813 and 1881.

For most of these travelers, Armenia formed a part of their itinerary, whereas for others it was one of the regions that lay en route to other destinations. Following the Russian annexation of Eastern Armenia in 1828, and throughout the 1830s, there was a notable increase in the number of travelers, some of whom produced detailed topographical surveys of the region. This upsurge in interest was perhaps a culmination of British fears earlier in the century of a possible French invasion of their imperial possessions in the East. J. M. Kinneir, who was a professional soldier and a diplomat, expressed this preoccupation unequivocally by stating that it was his determination "to visit all the countries through which a European army might attempt the invasion of India."¹

No biographical details are available for most of the travelers, the majority of whom were diplomats, though the group also comprised writers such as C. Macfarlane,

¹ John Macdonald Kinneir, *Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia, and Koordistan* (London, 1818), p. viii.

painters such as R. K. Porter, scholars such as R. Curzon, and ecclesiastics such as H. F. Tozer. Understandably, they favored and furthered British interest and policy which at this period has often been characterized by Russophobia. Seeing the Russo-Persian and the Russo-Ottoman wars of the nineteenth century and the Russian advance through the Caucasus and in Central Asia as a direct threat to India, Britain increasingly relied upon the Ottoman Empire as a viable military power to check Russian ambitions. This explains the Turkophile sentiments of some of the travelers such as C. Duncan and F. Burnaby. The latter, for example, not only professed extreme "philo-Turkish views," but actually commanded "the fifth Turkish brigade"² against the Russians in 1877.

One must perhaps be prepared to take with good humor the occasional outbursts of indignation from some travelers whom the strain of uncomfortable travel or the lack of cooperation and a whole range of imponderables rendered extremely irritable. Such annoyance can usually be distinguished from the contempt that a number of travelers exhibited in varying degrees. Whether tolerant liberals or cultivated conservatives, these travelers showed little or no consideration for the social and cultural peculiarities of the country they visited. In this regard, the earlier travelers were somewhat more tolerant toward their "Christian brethren"; later, although "commiserating" with the plight of "Eastern Christians," some travelers displayed arrogance and assumed superiority in the niceties of comportment.

The travelers came to Armenia with a preconceived image of the country and its past, usually based on old histories. The past is perhaps of no immediate relevance to a traveler's account, which essentially reflects contemporary realities, but few would deny that an acquaintance with it would allow the traveler to see those realities in perspective. The English travelers' knowledge of the Armenian past was, however, fragmentary. Some travelers may have manifested no interest in the early history of Armenia, yet others may

² *The Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 1959-60), III, 380-382.

have found no adequate sources, the state of Armenian studies being not so advanced as to bring out Armenia's specific contribution to culture at large. Nevertheless, although a number of travelers thought that there was "indeed much in the history of Armenia to interest the Christian and antiquarian,"³ others jumped to rash conclusions: Robert Curzon, for one, stated that Armenia was "worthless of itself."⁴

The English visitors, one and all, knew well the classical sources. Xenophon's description of the Retreat of the Ten Thousand in *Anabasis* was frequently called upon to illustrate a striking continuity: the peculiar underground dwellings of Armenia which had not changed for over two millennia. Of the old Armenian cities, Artaxata, Armavir, and Tigranocerta were known, as was Tigran the Great's story culled from the lopsided accounts of Roman historians; but the antique traditions of Hayk and Bel and the founding of Van by Semiramis and its subsequent rebuilding by Armenian kings the English travelers must have learned from Armenian sources.

With the towering exception of Mount Ararat, the English travelers almost completely neglected the biblical associations of Armenia. Most of them, though invariably pointing to its traditional importance as the resting place of Noah's Ark, lent no credibility to the story and the legends associated with it. J. Brant found Ararat's "height and its inaccessible nature . . . against the supposition, and the climate . . . too severe for the olive,"⁵ while W. F. Ainsworth argued in favor of Ararat being in the Gordyaeen chain⁶ far from the banks of Araxes. Curzon, in a laudable rational spirit, but in a scientifically unjustified interpretation, attributed the numerous revelations and visions concerning the Ark to

³ William Francis Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Armenia* (2 vols.; London, 1842), II, 393.

⁴ Robert Curzon, *Armenia: A Year at Erzerum, and on the Frontiers of Russia, Turkey, and Persia* (London, 1854), p. vii.

⁵ James Brant, "Notes of a Journey through a Part of Kurdistan, in the Summer of 1838," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, 10 (1841), 420.

⁶ Ainsworth, II, 340-342.

attacks of indigestion in the Armenian monks.⁷ By contrast, a highly skeptical traveler, J. Ussher, thoughtfully recorded two interesting legends:

The legends related about events said to have occurred to too curious investigators into the secrets of the holy mountain are very numerous, and always inculcate the same reverence and awe for the sacred ground, on which, if not the whole ark, at least some fragments of it, are still believed to rest. Ghouls, or beings half mortal, for they are born and die, half supernatural, for they live for a period surpassing the age of man, lurk in the rocky caverns, and dragging the lonely traveller or solitary shepherd into their bloodstained caves, there devour him at leisure. Most of the stories relating to these ferocious, yet stupid and cowardly monsters, whose existence has never been doubted by the inhabitants of the plains, run upon the manner in which they have been deceived by the ready wit of some intended victim. Another supernatural dweller on the haunted soil of Ararat is the ice-serpent, of which there is only one, existing in the caverns and crevasses that intersect the ice and snow near the summit. Of a light blue colour, and transparent as the purest crystal, it seldom issues from its frozen retreats, but when beheld, on those rare occasions, by those who are rash or curious enough to delay for an instant immediate flight, a mortal chilliness penetrates their frames, their bodies become benumbed and paralysed, and their lifeless corpses are found frozen, but in other respects uninjured, on the spot where the deadly glance of the ice-serpent fell on them.⁸

What struck the travelers most was Ararat's imposing view which they found stupendous, "rising in majestic and solitary grandeur."⁹ R. Wilbraham, a soldier with an artistic bent, described it at sunset:

The sun had only just sunk below the horizon, and Ararat stood forth in dark relief against the glowing sky. The mountain was of deepest purple; even the snow-clad peak

⁷ Curzon, p. 205.

⁸ John Ussher, *A Journey from London to Persepolis . . .* (London, 1865), pp. 286-287.

⁹ W. I. Hamilton, "Extracts from Notes Made on a Journey in Asia Minor in 1836," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, 7 (1837), 44.

was not distinguishable from the general mass. I have seen loftier mountains than Ararat, but its massive outline, the bold manner in which it rises from the immense plain of Arras and the powerful interest with which sacred history has invested it, unite in rendering it an object of wonder and awe.¹⁰

To many a traveler, the old or "received" image of the Armenians was that of a Christian people whose history began with their conversion to Christianity—a process the details of which were perhaps only a little more obscure to them than they are to us today. St. Gregory the Illuminator and King Trdat III were commended for accomplishing the task almost overnight, but few were those who recognized the importance of Mashdots's invention of the Armenian alphabet early in the fifth century and the subsequent role of the Armenian Church. Almost unanimously, they envisioned the Armenians as a persecuted Christian race, whose country saw only "moments of comparative calm and prosperity, swept across [by] tempest-like invasions"¹¹ of the Seljuks, the Mongols, the Turkoman tribes of Black and White Sheep, the Persians, and the Ottomans.

Reverend Tozer argued that the course of events could have taken a different turn had the Byzantine Empire pursued a farsighted policy toward the Armenians. The Bagratid Kingdom

was brought to an end by the suspicious and shortsighted policy of the Byzantine emperors, who conquered and annexed this province, thereby laying open their whole eastern frontier to the invasion of the Seljouk Turks, who shortly before this had commenced their attacks, and might have been successfully resisted by these hardy mountaineers in their powerful strongholds. The result was fatal to both parties, for Armenia was overrun and desolated, and by the battle of Manzikert, in 1071 A.D., in which the Emperor

¹⁰ Richard Wilbraham, *Travels in the Trans-Caucasian Provinces of Russia* . . . (London, 1839), p. 86.

¹¹ Ainsworth, II, 394.

Romanus IV was defeated and made prisoner by Alp Arslan, the whole of Asia Minor was left at the mercy of the Seljouks. . . .¹²

It was this particular period in history and the subsequent invasions of Armenia that were vividly identified by some travelers with the ruinous desolation of parts of Armenia, especially Ani and its neighborhood.

Our road [from Ani] continued south-east, over a series of low hills, without a tree or shrub to be seen, the entire country having the appearance of a vast wilderness, desolate and solitary, with here and there a ruin standing naked and isolated, as if to remind the traveller that this waste had once been fertile, populous, and inhabited by a highly civilized nation. Utterly devastated by the Tatars and Tamerlane, its cities destroyed, and its inhabitants either massacred or carried off into distant slavery, the face of the land has reassumed its primitive wildness, and now, abandoned to desolation, affords shelter chiefly to robber-bands, who fly to either Russian or Turkish territory to escape the consequences of their crimes. A few miserable, half-starved looking wretches are met with, few and far between, creeping about the mouldering walls of their mud huts, which are scarcely to be distinguished at a little distance from the surrounding soil.¹³

The only vestiges of Armenian civilization the travelers could judge for themselves were the architectural monuments and manuscripts. The French and English travelers of the nineteenth century rendered a valuable service to Armenian culture in that their detailed descriptions of Armenian churches brought Armenian architecture to the attention of European scholars. Although some travelers found Armenian architecture as "rude and inelegant,"¹⁴ the ruins of Ani were unanimously admired. The numerous churches were noted for their simple appearance: "... on a cape or headland . . . is one of those simple edifices solidly built of hewn stone without windows and nearly square, only

¹² Henry Fanshawe Tozer, *Turkish Armenia and Eastern Asia Minor* (London, 1881), p. 190.

¹³ Ussher, p. 246.

¹⁴ Wilbraham, p. 92.

with sloping roof and rounded at its eastern gable end which announces an Armenian church . . .”¹⁵ and for their solid structure:

They are little fortresses [that] have been erected to resist the incursions of the Saracens, Knights Templars, Koords, Turks, and Persians. . . . Their massive strength alone has saved them from being pulled down and utterly destroyed. . . . Nothing worth stealing remains in the various monasteries which I have visited. A few dirty and imperfect church-books, some faded vestments and poor furniture for the altar and the cells of three or four peasant-monks were all the wealth that they displayed.¹⁶

The fate of Armenian manuscripts, it was observed by numerous travelers, had not been any better: “[In Aghtamar] we were shown several manuscripts. . . . Many more had been lately taken to Constantinople, but the greatest loss had been sustained at the hands of the Kurds, who had destroyed many from sheer wantonness using the cover in some instances to make soles for their boots.”¹⁷

Having outlined the historical image of Armenia, I now turn to the contemporary image of Armenia and the Armenians as portrayed by the travelers. Geographically, Armenia was seen as the area to the south of the Black Sea and Georgia and to the north of the southern shore of Lake Van, with its western boundary running approximately from Bayburt in the north down through Kighi to Bingol in the south, and its eastern frontier extending to present-day Soviet Armenia and Karabagh. Van, Kars, and Erevan were considered as its largest cities, but Erzerum, regarded as its capital, was of particular importance in view of its strategic command of the road from and to Persia and the Caucasus. Generally regarded as quiet, industrious, and hospitable, the Armenians were seen as the indigenous population of Armenia proper. Here they lived side by side with Muslims and other Christians. Despite intermingling, there were

¹⁵ Ainsworth, II, 378.

¹⁶ Curzon, pp. 220-221.

¹⁷ Ussher, p. 331.

some virtually totally Armenian areas, such as the plain of Mush, which were studded with Armenian villages. The travelers reported that the Armenians spoke their mother tongue in rural areas and in most of the towns in the interior, but that they used primarily Turkish in the towns to the west of Erzerum. They also reported great numbers of Armenians emigrating from Armenia proper to the neighboring regions in quest of employment and security.

In speaking of the religious aspects of Armenian life, the travelers found the overwhelming majority of Armenians loyal to their national church. The adherents of the Catholic faith were a small minority, and their relationship with those of the Armenian Church was clearly characterized as inimical. The Armenian Catholics were looked upon by the travelers as the better educated and more Europeanized element, thanks principally to direct contacts with Europe and the literary labors of the Mekhitarists of Venice. Particularly after the 1850s, the travelers begin also to speak extensively, and highly, of the "small and still struggling community of Protestants."¹⁸

There was much truth to the travelers' view of the Armenian Church; but their characterization was also subjective and exaggerated. According to them, the Armenian Church was a "compound of superstition and empty forms, calculated to awe the unreflecting multitude, and to support a lazy and ignorant priesthood, who administer the rites of their religion in the mystic jargon of an unknown tongue."¹⁹ In view of the declining state of Armenian Christianity, the work of American missionaries was commended by the travelers. The only one to disagree was Tozer who, being in favor of national churches, maintained that the missionaries should concentrate on education and reforming the Armenian Church from within.²⁰

Of social realities, the travelers particularly observed,

¹⁸ Humphry Sandwith, *A Narrative of the Siege of Kars and of the Six Months' Resistance by the Turkish Garrison under General Williams to the Russian Army . . .* (London, 1856), p. 332.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

²⁰ Tozer, p. 236.

and sympathized with, the plight of Armenian women who were relegated to a secondary position in a still largely patriarchal family. Among the harshest of restrictions the travelers recorded was the seclusion of these industrious women who were "celebrated for their beauty and their fine eyes and black arched eyebrows."²¹

The image of the Armenians, men and women alike, as second-class citizens suffering serious legal disabilities, misgovernment, and heavy taxation clearly emerges from the comments of most travelers on the political conditions that prevailed in Armenia. Charles Duncan, a soldier, was among the few who claimed that the Christians in general enjoyed "great toleration and many privileges."²² Citing the exemption of Christians from conscription—perhaps as one of the privileges he had in mind—Duncan failed to mention that such exemption was not of the Christians' choosing and that taxes were levied instead. He also chose to disregard what his colleagues observed unanimously, namely, the disabilities the Christians suffered such as the nonacceptance of Christian testimony and the prohibition against the Christians' bearing arms. A number of travelers noted the restrictions on building or renovating churches and cited examples of exacerbating oppression ranging from the contemptuous treatment of *rayahs* to the issuing of burial permits written in a most humiliating style.

In addition to the regular taxes levied on Armenians by the Ottoman government, the travelers reported extra exactions, the heaviest of which was perhaps the *kishlak*: "This is the quartering of the nomad Kurds on the Armenian villages in the plain in the winter-time. During that season these mountaineers and their cattle are distributed among the Christian population, who provide them with everything and receive no payment in return."²³

In the remote Armenian provinces, particularly in Mush, where the semi-independent Kurdish tribes plundered with

²¹ Curzon, p. 233.

²² Charles Duncan, *A Campaign with the Turks in Asia* (2 vols.; London, 1855), I, 291.

²³ Tozer, p. 285.

impunity, there could be no security of life and property: "The Armenians of the district of Mush have hitherto not only been subject to an authorized vexation and spoilation entailed by Kurdish supremacy but also to frequent incursions of the same predatory tribes; on which occasions they drive away all their cattle, sheep, and goats, and treat the inhabitants according as they submit quietly to be left destitute, or resist this cruel system of plunder."²⁴

Under the circumstances, several travelers were quick to note, with some justification it seems, that the Armenians had become a timid and "degenerate" race "from ages of oppression."²⁵ No traveler failed, however, to qualify their industry, productivity, and intelligence as proverbial, attesting that they "filled all the places of artisans, and all those requiring active industry and intelligence."²⁶

Perhaps no other aspect of the Armenian image was so unanimously agreed upon as that of the Armenian as a trader "engaged in trade in most of the capitals of Europe and throughout the length and breadth of Asia."²⁷ They were thought of as sharp businessmen, "quick in matters of business, so alert if you appear to want anything, yet so hard at a bargain; so ready to show, yet so sticklish about price in selling."²⁸ But the admiration of one of the travelers for the Armenian merchants as being "everywhere distinguished by superior cultivation, honesty and manners"²⁹ was not shared by many travelers who noted that many merchants were "not remarkable for truthfulness."³⁰ One must immediately point out, however, that almost no traveler substantiated such allegations with instances of dishonesty which he had personally experienced. One of them, C. Macfarlane, went far beyond mechanical repetition.

²⁴ Ainsworth, II, 379.

²⁵ Sandwith, p. 47.

²⁶ Duncan, I, 106.

²⁷ Tozer, p. 193.

²⁸ James Baillie Fraser, *A Winter's Journey from Constantinople to Tehran* . . . (2 vols.; London, 1838), I, 171.

²⁹ J. L. Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in the Russian and Turkish Empires* (2 vols.; London, 1839), I, 209.

³⁰ Sandwith, p. 181.

He was "grieved" to see his countrymen being gradually replaced by Armenian and Greek merchants in Smyrna and to foresee the decline of British influence this would entail. But economic, political, and patriotic considerations aside, Macfarlane was also distressed by some social concerns:

These smyrniote brokers and backals [grocers], who now take the lead have certainly vulgarized the place. Elated by their commercial success, they thrust themselves into all the highest or foremost places without any regard to the feelings of those who held them so long, and whose humble and crouching servants they were only a few years since. Modesty and diffidence were never distinguishing qualities in the Greek character; and ingratitude, purse-pride, sullenness, arrogance, and *grossièreté* are but too common among the Armenian race.³¹

At times Macfarlane's literary style was clearly out of tune with his mental disposition, and the seriousness with which he treated trivialities often rendered his contemptuous intentions comical as in the following fine imagery: "[In Pera, Istanbul] a crowd of garlic-feeding Armenians would send whiffs at us that made us stagger as though we had been hit by grape-shot."³²

Macfarlane made some interesting and valid observations, particularly with regard to manners, but his sweeping generalizations can only be regarded as an extreme expression of ill will:

The baths were crowded and crammed. Yet on the next day, a holiday and a Sunday, there were fresh and fresh arrivals of Armenians. We lost ourselves in conjecture as to the how and where they could all be stowed away in the khan. I tried hard to get a wash and stew myself. All in vain—every vase, bath, and hole containing hot water was filled by some Armenian, male or female; and, having once taken possession, they were sure to keep it for many hours—for these people not only wash and stew, but eat,

³¹ Charles Macfarlane, *Turkey and Its Destiny* . . . (2 vols.; London, 1850), I, 27.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 41.

drink, sing, smoke, sleep, and wake and eat and drink and smoke and sleep again in these baths. As for the women, when they enter in the morning, they are pretty sure not to come forth until the evening.

. . . On the morrow I again made an effort to get a warm bath for myself. I was told that there was one disengaged; but when I was almost at the door a rude Armenian rushed by me and took possession. A Turk would not have done this, nor would a Greek. But this was not the first time nor the last that I made the reflection that the purse-proud Armenian is the rudest and most selfish animal in Orient.³³

As an interested observer, Macfarlane also devoted numerous pages to the role of the Armenian bankers in the economy of the Ottoman Empire. He represented them as vampires who, leagued together, had "their hands in everything: from the purchase of a cargo of Newcastle coals for the use of the Arsenal, to the marrying of a Sultana." Nothing, Macfarlane asserted, could "be done without the Armenian seraffs"³⁴ and suggested that it was time "the Armenian incubus should be shaken off."³⁵ Macfarlane, as usual, was exaggerating: the omnipotence he attributed to the bankers was simply unfounded, and the chaotic state of the Ottoman economy was the result of far more serious causes than the incompetence, the extravagance, or the wicked designs of the Armenian bankers. Macfarlane's charges concerning the usury of the bankers can hardly be contested, but such practice was by no means characteristic of all Armenians as he implicitly suggested. His glaring inability to make sound and dispassionate judgments was perhaps one of the major reasons for the following assessment of his literary heritage: "Macfarlane's historical novels are readable, but his biographies . . . his histories and books of travel go far to justify the 'Athenaeum's' reference to him as a 'voluminous, not a luminous writer'."³⁶

³³ Ibid., pp. 196-197.

³⁴ Ibid., II, 168.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 183.

³⁶ *Dictionary of National Biography*, XII, 518-519.

The allegations of a number of travelers (mainly soldiers) regarding pro-Russian sympathy among Armenians in certain regions such as Erzerum and Kars were conflicting. J. B. Fraser, who was in the area in the 1830s on an intelligence-gathering mission, reported anti-Russian feelings not only amongst the Armenians of Bayazid, but also those of Erevan. In 1855, C. Duncan and H. Sandwith, who had come to assist the Turks during the siege of Kars, reported pro-Russian Armenian activities in Kars. In the same year, Curzon asserted that the Armenians who had accompanied the withdrawing Russian army in 1830 regretted their rash decision and had since been endeavoring "by every means in their power, to return to the lesser evils of the frying-pan of Turkey, from whence they had leapt into the fire of despotic Russia."³⁷ In the mid-1870s, Burnaby quoted the Turkish governor of Divrik: "In some districts which are very near Russia, and where the Armenians have the opportunity of seeing the Russians as they are and not as they pretend to be, the Christians prefer being under the Turkish rule; but the Armenians in our central provinces are constantly being tampered with by Russian agents."³⁸

At about the same period, Tozer had this to say regarding Erzerum and its neighborhood: "Owing to the proximity of the Russian frontier we had expected to find that amongst the Armenians of this part Russian influence was predominant. But this was not the case, for that nation was not in good odour in Erzeroum owing to the intemperance and incontinence of their soldiers at the time of occupation [of Erzerum]."³⁹

Some of the travelers conceded, though somewhat reluctantly, that misgovernment was the major, if not the only, reason that accounted for the Russophile sentiments on the part of some Armenians. Duncan, who contended that the "Greeks and Armenians established at Kars . . . were

³⁷ Curzon, p. 204.

³⁸ Fred Burnaby, *On Horseback through Asia Minor* (2 vols.; London, 1877), I, 347.

³⁹ Tozer, p. 415.

all Russian at heart,"⁴⁰ conceded that the Armenians "accepted arms from the Russians more with the intention of repelling the outrages of the Turkish bashi-bozooks, irregulars, than from a wish to change masters."⁴¹ Having labeled the Armenian villages on the Russo-Ottoman border as the "zealous partisans"⁴² of the Czar, Sandwith offered the following explanation: "Our indignation at their open and industrious partisanship in favour of the enemy was somewhat modified when we heard of the wrongs and oppression which had been heaped upon them. The Bash-Bozooks had brought in crops of their heads occasionally during their forays. . . ." ⁴³

Sandwith gave a more detailed account: "These expeditions resembled Dyak head-hunts; the Pasha gave a baksheesh for each Ghiaour's [Infidel's] head, and hordes of savage Bash-Bozooks, as well as regular troops, fell upon the unoffending inhabitants of the villages, and reaped a rich harvest of heads. I was told that women and children, the old and infirm, were not exempt from these extraordinary forays."⁴⁴ It is interesting to note that it was mainly the military who were preoccupied with pro-Russian sentiments in the region, apparently to underline the necessity of strengthening the Ottoman Empire as an effective barrier against Russian ambitions.

In conclusion, a few points about the travelers' impressions must be considered. It is obvious from this survey that the accounts lacked depth and were limited in scope, due probably to reasons originating in the nature of the genre of travel literature itself. In addition to what they say, the travelers also reported what they heard, and, frequently, made use of the observations of their colleagues. Often a traveler embarked on a journey with a preconceived image based on the impressions of earlier travelers and thus helped,

⁴⁰ Duncan, I, 203.

⁴¹ Ibid., II, 291.

⁴² Sandwith, p. 127.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 129.

whether wittingly or unwittingly, to perpetuate certain images. Burnaby, for example, before he had even met an Armenian, decided to employ a Muslim servant "who could speak no other language than his own. In that case he would be less likely to have learned any bad habits from the Armenians."⁴⁵ One must also make generous allowances for the prejudices that colored their remarks. Undoubtedly, there was much truth, flattering as well as unflattering, in their eyewitness accounts, especially those of an individual and isolated nature. But their generalizations, often based on unsubstantiated reports or hearsay, must be treated with skepticism; for, with some notable exceptions, they were chiefly riders whose elongated shadows blurred almost every snapshot they took.

⁴⁵ Burnaby, I, 18-19.